Case 3:09-cv-02880-JLS-NLS Document 40 Filed 09/16/10 PageID.441 Page 1 of 3

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the above, the Court **HEREBY ORDERS** the following:

- (1) Defendant's motion for an extension of the fact discovery cutoff is **DENIED**;
- (2) Plaintiff's motion to stay or quash the depositions of Sean Johnson and Ryan Moore to take place on September 17, 2010, is **DENIED**;
 - (3) Plaintiff's motion to stay the deposition of FDIC as Receiver is **GRANTED**;
 - (4) Plaintiff's motion for a protective order with regard to the deposition of FDIC as Receiver is

August 6, 2010. [Doc. No. 23] The Court subsequently extended this deadline to September 20, 2010. [Doc. No. 34.] Currently before the Court is Defendant SDCHC's motion to extend fact discovery by 30 additional days. [Doc. No. 35.] The FDIC filed an Opposition. [Doc. No. 36.]

Also before the Court is FDIC's motion to stay or quash depositions of Ryan Moore and Sean

On March 22, 2010 the Court issued a Scheduling Order setting a fact discovery deadline of

Also before the Court is FDIC's motion to stay or quash depositions of Ryan Moore and Sean Johnson, employees of the FDIC contractor who allegedly entered the reconveyance contract with SDCHC, and the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of the FDIC as Receiver. Alternatively, Plaintiff requests that the Court issue a Protective Order continuing the date of the FDIC deposition and limiting the scope of the deposition inquiry.

II. DISCUSSION

The Court has previously extended the discovery cutoff in this case and does not find good cause to grant an additional extension. The deposition notices while served on the eve of discovery cutoff and with nearly unreasonable notice (only six business days for Sean Johnson and Ryan Moore) and nine business days for the FDIC were nevertheless noticed before the fact discovery deadline. The Court finds that the depositions of Sean Johnson and Ryan Moore, fact witnesses known to both parties for some time, should go forward tomorrow as noticed. However, the subject areas noticed for the FDIC's Rule 30(b)(6) deposition are so overly broad that the Court finds good cause to stay this deposition and issue a protective order such that the FDIC deposition shall not go forward until further order of the court. The parties shall meet and confer in an effort to limit the subject areas for the FDIC deposition and agree on a reasonable date for the FDIC deposition. The parties shall submit a joint statement to the court on the results of their meet and confer as ordered below.

GRANTED until further order of the court. Regarding the FDIC deposition, the parties are to meet and confer on or before Wednesday <u>September 22, 2010</u> and submit to this Court a joint statement on or before Friday, <u>September 24, 2010</u>. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: September 16, 2010 Hon. Nita L. Stormes U.S. Magistrate Judge United States District Court